

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

IONUT MADALIN ZAMFIR and DANIEL  
ANDRONACHE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cr-00180-LK

ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
AND DENYING IN PART  
UNOPPOSED MOTION TO  
EXTEND PRETRIAL MOTIONS  
DEADLINE

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Daniel Andronache's Unopposed Motion to Extend Due Date for Pretrial Motions, seeking to extend his current pretrial motion deadline from December 21, 2023 to December 28, 2023. Dkt. No. 42; *see* Dkt. No. 41 at 2. Mr. Andronache represents that "[t]he parties have conferred, and due to ongoing negotiation regarding an offer proposed by [the Government], no party opposes the extension." Dkt. No. 42 at 2. The Court notes that his co-defendant, Ionut Zamfir, still has a pretrial motion deadline of December 21, 2023. Dkt. No. 36.

1 Under Local Criminal Rule 12(c), good cause must be shown to extend the deadline for  
2 pretrial motions. Mr. Andronache's motion demonstrates good cause. However, granting the  
3 request in full would leave the Court only seven business days to resolve the motion(s) prior to the  
4 start of trial. *See* LCrR 12(b)(6) ("[M]otions shall be noted for consideration twelve days after the  
5 day of filing[.]"). Providing the Court inadequate time to address pretrial motions does not serve  
6 the interests of justice. *See United States v. Gutierrez-Fosella*, Case No. 22-cr-00042-LK, Dkt. No.  
7 44 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 22, 2022). For that reason, the Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN  
8 PART the request and sets a new deadline to file pretrial motions by December 26, 2023.<sup>1</sup> The  
9 Court cautions that it will not grant further extensions of the pretrial motions deadline absent a  
10 concurrent continuance of the trial date.

11  
12 Dated this 20th day of December, 2023.

13 

14 Lauren King  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> This timing too would normally be unacceptable. Due to counsel's filing of this motion only one day prior to the  
24 deadline (something that should be avoided, *see* LCrR 12(b)(10)), the Court is accommodating a short extension, but  
will not do so in the future.